arXiv:1610.06723v1 [hep-ph] 21 Oct 2016

Study on $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decays

Junfeng Sun,[1] Lili Chen,[1] Na Wang,[2] Jinshu Huang,[3] Yueling Yang,[1] and Qin Chang[1]

[1]*Institute of Particle and Nuclear Physics, Henan Normal University, Xinxiang 453007, China*

[2]*Institute of Particle and Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China*

[3]*College of Physics and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Normal University, Nanyang 473061, China*

Abstract

With anticipation of abundant Upsilons data sample at high-luminosity heavy-flavor experiments in the future, we studied nonleptonic two-body weak decays of $\Upsilon(nS)$ below the open-bottom threshold with $n = 1$, 2 and 3. It is found that branching ratios for $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S) \to B_c\rho$ decays are relatively large among Upsilons decay into $B_c M$ final states ($M = \pi$ ρ, K and K^*) and can reach up to 10^{-10}, which is promisingly detected by experiments at the running LHC and forthcoming SuperKEKB.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Gv 12.39.St 14.40.Pq

I. INTRODUCTION

About forty years after the discovery of Upsilons (the bound states of $b\bar{b}$ with quantum number of $I^GJ^{PC} = 0^-1^{--}$ [1]) at Fermilab in 1977 [2], the properties of bottomonium system continue to be the subject of intensive theoretical and experimental study. Major contributions were made recently by experiments at the asymmetric electron-positron colliders KEK-B with Belle detector and PEP-II with BaBar detector, and the hadron colliders Tevatron and LHC [3].

Some of the salient features of Upsilons are as follows [4]: (1) In the center-of-mass frame of Upsilons, the relative motion of the bottom quark is sufficiently slow. Nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation can be used to describe well the spectrum of bottomonium system and thus one can learn about the interquark binding forces. (2) The $\Upsilon(nS)$ particles below the open-bottom threshold, with the radial quantum number $n = 1$, 2 and 3, decay primarily via the annihilation of the $b\bar{b}$ quark pairs into three gluons, which also provide an entry to many potential final states including glueballs, hybrid and multiquark states. Thus the properties of the invisible gluons and of the gluon-quark coupling can be gleaned through the study of hadronic Upsilons decay. (3) Compared with the light u, d, s quarks, the relatively large mass of the b quark implies a nonnegligible coupling to the Higgs bosons, making Upsilons to be one of the best hunting grounds for light Higgs particles. By now, our knowledge of the properties of Upsilons comes mostly from e^+e^- collision.

As is well known, Upsilons decay mainly through the strong and electromagnetic interactions. The coupling constant α_s for hadronic Upsilons decay is smaller than that for charmonium decay due to the Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) asymptotic freedom. In addition, the coupling between Upsilons and photon is proportional to the electric charges of the bottom quark. So, one of the outstanding properties of Upsilons below $B\bar{B}$ threshold is their narrow decay width of tens of keV [1] (see Table I). Besides, as an essential complement to Upsilons decay modes, the Upsilons weak decay is allowable within the standard model and might be accessible at experiments, although the branching ratio is tiny, about $2/\tau_B\Gamma_\Upsilon \sim 10^{-8}$ [1]. In this paper, we will estimate the branching ratios for nonleptonic two-body $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_cM$ weak decays, where $M = \pi$, ρ, K and K^*. The motivation is listed as follows.

From the experimental point of view, (1) there is plenty of Upsilons at the high-luminosity

TABLE I: Summary of the mass, decay width and data samples of Upsilons below $B\bar{B}$ threshold collected by Belle, BaBar and CLEO Collaborations.

meson	properties [1]		data samples (10^6)		
	mass (MeV)	width (keV)	Belle [5]	BaBar [6]	CLEO [7]
$\Upsilon(1S)$	9460.30±0.26	54.02±1.25	102	...	22.78
$\Upsilon(2S)$	10023.26±0.31	31.98±2.63	158	121.8	9.45
$\Upsilon(3S)$	10355.2±0.5	20.32±1.85	11	98.6	8.89

dedicated bottomonium factories. Over 10^8 Upsilons data samples have been collected at Belle and BaBar experiments (see Table I). Upsilons are also observed by the on-duty ALICE [8], ATLAS [9], CMS [10], LHCb [11] experiments at LHC. It is hopefully expected that more than 10^{11} $b\bar{b}$ quark pairs would be available per fb^{-1} data at LHCb [12] and huge Upsilons data samples could be accumulated with great precision at the forthcoming SuperKEKB [13]. A large amount of data samples will provide opportunities to search for Upsilons weak decays which in some cases might be detectable. Hence, theoretical studies on Upsilons weak decays are very necessary to offer a ready reference. (2) For nonleptonic two-body $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ weak decay, the final states with opposite charges have definite energy and momentum in the $\Upsilon(nS)$ rest frame. In addition, identification of a single charged B_c meson would provide an unambiguous signature of Upsilons weak decay, which is free from double tagging of the b-flavored hadron pairs. The small branching ratios make the observation of Upsilons weak decays very difficult, and evidences of an abnormally production rate of a single B_c meson in Upsilons decay might be a hint of new physics beyond the standard model.

From the theoretical point of view, nonleptonic Upsilon weak decay could allow one to overconstrain parameters obtained from B meson decay, test various models and improve our understanding on the strong interactions and the mechanism responsible for heavy meson weak decay. Phenomenologically, the $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ weak decays are monopolized by tree contribution and favored by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark mixing matrix element V_{cb}, so they should have relatively large branching ratios. The amplitudes for the $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decay are commonly written as factorizable product of two factors: one describing the transition between Upsilon and B_c meson, and the other depicting the

production of the M state from the vacuum. The earlier works, including Refs. [14, 15] based on a heavy quark effective theory and Ref. [16] based on the Bauer-Stech-Wirbel (BSW) model [17], riveted mainly upon the $\Upsilon(1S) \to B_c$ transition form factors. No research works devoted to nonleptonic $\Upsilon(2S)$, $\Upsilon(3S)$ weak decays. In recent years, several attractive QCD-inspired methods have been developed to treat with the hadronic matrix elements of heavy flavor weak decay. In this paper, we will estimate branching ratios for nonleptonic two-body $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ weak decay, by considering nonfactorizable contributions to hadronic matrix elements with the QCD factorization (QCDF) approach [18], and calculating the transition form factor between Upsilon and B_c meson with nonrelativistic wave functions.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we will present the theoretical framework and the amplitudes for $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decays. Section III is devoted to numerical results and discussion. The last section is our summary.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. The effective Hamiltonian

Using the operator product expansion technique, the effective Hamiltonian responsible for $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decays is [19]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \;=\; \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{q=d,s} V_{cb}V_{uq}^* \Big\{ C_1(\mu)\, Q_1(\mu) + C_2(\mu)\, Q_2(\mu) \Big\} + \text{h.c.}, \tag{1}$$

where the Fermi coupling constant $G_F = 1.166{\times}10^{-5}\,\text{GeV}^{-2}$ [1]; The CKM factors can be expanded as a power series in the Wolfenstein parameter $\lambda = 0.22537(61)$ [1],

$$V_{cb}V_{ud}^* \;=\; A\lambda^2 - \frac{1}{2}A\lambda^4 - \frac{1}{8}A\lambda^6 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^8), \tag{2}$$

$$V_{cb}V_{us}^* \;=\; A\lambda^3 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^8). \tag{3}$$

The Wilson coefficients $C_{1,2}(\mu)$ summarize the physical contributions above scales of μ, which are calculable with the perturbation theory and have properly been evaluated to the next-to-leading order (NLO). Their values at scale of $\mu \sim \mathcal{O}(m_b)$ can be evaluated with the renormalization group (RG) equation [19]

$$C_{1,2}(\mu) = U(\mu, m_W) C_{1,2}(m_W), \tag{4}$$

where the RG evolution matrix $U(\mu, m_W)$ transforms the Wilson coefficients from scale of m_W to μ. The expression of $U(\mu, m_W)$ can be found in Ref. [19]. With the naive dimensional regularization (NDR) scheme, the numerical values of Wilson coefficients $C_{1,2}$ are listed in Table II.

The local tree four-quark operators are defined as follows.

$$Q_1 = [\bar{c}_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1-\gamma_5) b_\alpha][\bar{q}_\beta \gamma^\mu (1-\gamma_5) u_\beta], \tag{5}$$

$$Q_2 = [\bar{c}_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1-\gamma_5) b_\beta][\bar{q}_\beta \gamma^\mu (1-\gamma_5) u_\alpha], \tag{6}$$

where α and β are color indices and the sum over repeated indices is understood.

To obtain the decay amplitudes, the remaining and also the most intricate part is how to calculate accurately hadronic matrix elements squeezing the local operators between initial Upsilons and final $B_c M$ states.

B. Hadronic matrix elements

Analogous to the usual applications of hard exclusive processes in perturbative QCD proposed by Lepage and Brodsky [20], the QCDF approach is based on the collinear factorization approximation and power countering rules in the heavy quark limit, where hadronic matrix elements are written as the convolution integrals of hard scattering subamplitudes and universal wave functions [18]. The QCDF approach has been widely applied to B meson weak decays. As for the $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decay, using the QCDF master formula, hadronic matrix elements can be written as :

$$\langle B_c M | Q_i | \Upsilon \rangle = \sum_j F_j^{\Upsilon \to B_c} \int dx\, H_j(x)\, \Phi_M(x), \tag{7}$$

where both transition form factor $F_i^{\Upsilon \to B_c}$ and wave function $\Phi_M(x)$ are universal and non-perturbative input parameters. For a light pseudoscalar and vector meson, the leading twist distribution amplitude can be expressed in terms of Gegenbauer polynomials [21]:

$$\phi_M(x) = 6\, x\bar{x} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^M\, C_n^{3/2}(x - \bar{x}), \tag{8}$$

where $\bar{x} = 1 - x$; a_n^M is the Gegenbauer moment and $a_0^M \equiv 1$.

Hard scattering function, $H_j(x)$, is assumed to be calculable order by order from the first principle of perturbative QCD theory. At order of α_s^0, $H_j(x) = 1$ and the integral for wave

function in Eq.(7) results in decay constant f_M, which is the simplest scenario. At order of α_s and higher orders, expression of $H_j(x)$ is no longer trivial, part of strong phases and renormalization scale dependence of amplitude can be recuperated from hadronic matrix elements. The decay amplitudes could be written as

$$\mathcal{A}(\Upsilon\to B_c M) = \langle B_c M|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}|\Upsilon\rangle = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\, V_{cb}V_{uq}^*\, a_1\, \langle M|J^\mu|0\rangle\langle B_c|J_\mu|\Upsilon\rangle. \tag{9}$$

The coefficient a_1 in Eq.(9), containing nonfactorizable contributions to hadronic matrix elements, is written as:

$$a_1 = C_1^{\rm NLO} + \frac{1}{N_c}\, C_2^{\rm NLO} + \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\,\frac{C_F}{N_c}\, C_2^{\rm LO}\, V. \tag{10}$$

The explicit expression of parameter V is the same as that in Ref. [22]. It has been shown that coefficient a_1 is infrared-safe and renormalization scale independent at order of α_s [22]. The numerical values of coefficient a_1 at scales of $\mu \sim \mathcal{O}(m_b)$ are listed in Table II. From the numbers in Table II, it is seen that one could get part information of strong phase by taking nonfactorizable corrections into account, though the strong phase is small and suppressed by factor α_s/N_c.

TABLE II: Numerical values of the Wilson coefficients $C_{1,2}$ with NDR scheme and parameter a_1 for the $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c\pi$ decay, where $m_b = 4.78$ GeV [1].

	LO		NLO		
μ	C_1	C_2	C_1	C_2	a_1
$0.5\,m_b$	1.173	-0.346	1.132	-0.277	$1.081e^{-i2^\circ}$
m_b	1.112	-0.240	1.078	-0.176	$1.057e^{-i1^\circ}$
$1.5\,m_b$	1.086	-0.192	1.055	-0.130	$1.045e^{-i1^\circ}$
$2.0\,m_b$	1.071	-0.161	1.042	-0.101	$1.038e^{-i1^\circ}$

C. Decay constants and form factors

The matrix elements of current operators are defined as follows:

$$\langle P(p)|A_\mu|0\rangle \;=\; -if_P\, p_\mu, \tag{11}$$

$$\langle V(p,\epsilon)|V_\mu|0\rangle \;=\; f_V\, m_V\, \epsilon^*_{V,\mu}, \tag{12}$$

where f_P and f_V are the decay constants of pseudoscalar and vector mesons, respectively; m_V and ϵ_V denote the mass and polarization of vector meson, respectively.

The transition form factors are defined as follows [15–17]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle B_c(p_2)|V_\mu - A_\mu|\Upsilon(p_1,\epsilon)\rangle \\
=\ & -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\,\epsilon_\Upsilon^\nu\, q^\alpha\,(p_1+p_2)^\beta\,\frac{V^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(q^2)}{m_\Upsilon + m_{B_c}} - i\,\frac{2\,m_\Upsilon\,\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot q}{q^2}\,q_\mu\,A_0^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(q^2) \\
& -i\,\epsilon_{\Upsilon,\mu}\,(m_\Upsilon + m_{B_c})\,A_1^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(q^2) - i\,\frac{\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot q}{m_\Upsilon + m_{B_c}}\,(p_1+p_2)_\mu\,A_2^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(q^2) \\
& +i\,\frac{2\,m_\Upsilon\,\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot q}{q^2}\,q_\mu\,A_3^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(q^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $q = p_1 - p_2$; and $A_0(0) = A_3(0)$ is required compulsorily to cancel singularities at the pole $q^2 = 0$. There is a relation among these form factors

$$2m_\Upsilon A_3(q^2) = (m_\Upsilon + m_{B_c})A_1(q^2) + (m_\Upsilon - m_{B_c})A_2(q^2). \tag{14}$$

The form factors, $A_{0,1}(0)$ and $V(0)$ at the pole $q^2 = 0$ are defined as [17],

$$A_0^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(0) = \int d\vec{k}_\perp \int_0^1 dx \left\{\Phi_\Upsilon(\vec{k}_\perp, x, 1, 0)\,\sigma_z\,\Phi_{B_c}(\vec{k}_\perp, x, 0, 0)\right\}, \tag{15}$$

$$A_1^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(0) = \frac{m_b + m_c}{m_\Upsilon + m_{B_c}} I^{\Upsilon\to B_c} \tag{16}$$

$$V^{\Upsilon\to B_c}(0) = \frac{m_b - m_c}{m_\Upsilon - m_{B_c}} I^{\Upsilon\to B_c}, \tag{17}$$

$$I^{\Upsilon\to B_c} = \sqrt{2}\int d\vec{k}_\perp \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x} \left\{\Phi_\Upsilon(\vec{k}_\perp, x, 1, -1)\,i\sigma_y\,\Phi_{B_c}(\vec{k}_\perp, x, 0, 0)\right\}, \tag{18}$$

where $\sigma_{y,z}$ is a Pauli matrix acting on the spin indices of the decaying bottom quark; x and $\vec{k}_\perp$ denote the fraction of the longitudinal momentum and the transverse momentum carried by the nonspectator quark, respectively.

For Upsilons, the bottom quark is nonrelativistic with an average velocity $v \ll 1$ based on arguments of nonrelativistic quantum chromodynamics (NRQCD) [23]. For the double-heavy B_c meson, both bottom and charm quarks are nonrelativistic due to $m_{B_c} \approx m_b + m_c$. Here, we will take the solution of the Schödinger equation with an isotropic harmonic oscillator potential as wave functions of Upsilons and B_c states, i.e.,

$$\phi_{1S}(\vec{k}) \sim e^{-\vec{k}^2/2\alpha^2}, \tag{19}$$

$$\phi_{2S}(\vec{k}) \sim e^{-\vec{k}^2/2\alpha^2}(2\vec{k}^2 - 3\alpha^2), \tag{20}$$

$$\phi_{3S}(\vec{k}) \sim e^{-\vec{k}^2/2\alpha^2}(4\vec{k}^4 - 20\vec{k}^2\alpha^2 + 15\alpha^4), \tag{21}$$

where the parameter α determines the average transverse quark momentum, $\langle\phi_{1S}|\vec{k}_\perp^2|\phi_{1S}\rangle = \alpha^2$. With the NRQCD power counting rules [23], $|\vec{k}_\perp| \sim mv \sim m\alpha_s$ for heavy quarkonium. Hence, parameter α is approximately taken as $m\alpha_s$ in our calculation. Using the substitution ansatz [24],

$$\vec{k}^2 \to \frac{\vec{k}_\perp^2 + \bar{x}\, m_q^2 + x\, m_b^2}{4\, x\, \bar{x}}, \tag{22}$$

one can obtain

$$\phi_{1S}(\vec{k}_\perp, x) = A \exp\Big\{\frac{\vec{k}_\perp^2 + \bar{x}\, m_q^2 + x\, m_b^2}{-8\,\alpha^2\, x\, \bar{x}}\Big\}, \tag{23}$$

$$\phi_{2S}(\vec{k}_\perp, x) = B\, \phi_{1S}(\vec{k}_\perp, x)\Big\{\frac{\vec{k}_\perp^2 + m_b^2}{6\,\alpha^2\, x\, \bar{x}} - 1\Big\}, \tag{24}$$

$$\phi_{3S}(\vec{k}_\perp, x) = C\, \phi_{1S}(\vec{k}_\perp, x)\Big\{\frac{2}{5}\Big(\frac{\vec{k}_\perp^2 + m_b^2}{4\,\alpha^2\, x\, \bar{x}} - \frac{5}{2}\Big)^2 - 1\Big\}, \tag{25}$$

where parameters A, B and C are normalization factors.

TABLE III: Numerical values of transition form factors at $q^2 = 0$, where uncertainties of this work are from the masses of bottom and charm quarks, and numbers in Ref. [16] are computed with the flavor dependent parameter ω the BSW model.

transition	reference	$A_0(0)$	$A_1(0)$	$A_2(0)$	$V(0)$
$\Upsilon(1S) \to B_c$	[16]	0.46	0.62	0.38	1.61
	this work	0.67±0.02	0.70±0.02	0.51±0.06	1.66±0.02
$\Upsilon(2S) \to B_c$	this work	0.65±0.02	0.69±0.02	0.48±0.04	1.44±0.03
$\Upsilon(3S) \to B_c$	this work	0.57±0.01	0.64±0.01	0.29±0.03	1.25±0.05

The numerical values of transition form factors at $q^2 = 0$ are collected in Table III. It is found that (1) form factors for the $\Upsilon(1S) \to B_c$ transition are generally larger than those in Ref. [16]. (2) The value of form factor at $q^2 = 0$ decreases gradually with the increase of the radial quantum number of Upsilons.

D. Decay amplitudes

With the above definition of hadronic matrix elements, the decay amplitudes for $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decays can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}(\Upsilon\to B_c^+\pi^-) = \sqrt{2}\,G_F\,V_{cb}\,V_{ud}^*\,a_1\,f_\pi\,m_\Upsilon\,(\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot p_\pi)\,A_0^{\Upsilon\to B_c}, \tag{26}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\Upsilon\to B_c^+K^-) = \sqrt{2}\,G_F\,V_{cb}\,V_{us}^*\,a_1\,f_K\,m_\Upsilon\,(\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot p_K)\,A_0^{\Upsilon\to B_c}, \tag{27}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(\Upsilon\to B_c^+\rho^-) &= -i\,\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\,V_{cb}\,V_{ud}^*\,a_1\,f_\rho\,m_\rho\Big\{(\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot\epsilon_\rho^*)\,(m_\Upsilon+m_{B_c})\,A_1^{\Upsilon\to B_c}\\ &+(\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot p_\rho)\,(\epsilon_\rho^*\cdot p_\Upsilon)\,\frac{2\,A_2^{\Upsilon\to B_c}}{m_\Upsilon+m_{B_c}} - i\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\,\epsilon_\Upsilon^\mu\,\epsilon_\rho^{*\nu}\,p_\Upsilon^\alpha\,p_\rho^\beta\,\frac{2\,V^{\Upsilon\to B_c}}{m_\Upsilon+m_{B_c}}\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(\Upsilon\to B_c^+K^{*-}) &= -i\,\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\,V_{cb}\,V_{us}^*\,a_1\,f_{K^*}\,m_{K^*}\Big\{(\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot\epsilon_{K^*}^*)\,(m_\Upsilon+m_{B_c})\,A_1^{\Upsilon\to B_c}\\ &+(\epsilon_\Upsilon\cdot p_{K^*})\,(\epsilon_{K^*}^*\cdot p_\Upsilon)\,\frac{2\,A_2^{\Upsilon\to B_c}}{m_\Upsilon+m_{B_c}} - i\,\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\,\epsilon_\Upsilon^\mu\,\epsilon_{K^*}^{*\nu}\,p_\Upsilon^\alpha\,p_{K^*}^\beta\,\frac{2\,V^{\Upsilon\to B_c}}{m_\Upsilon+m_{B_c}}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the center-of-mass frame of Upsilons, branching ratio for nonleptonic $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ weak decays can be written as

$$\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon\to B_c M) = \frac{1}{12\pi}\,\frac{p_{\rm cm}}{m_\Upsilon^2\Gamma_\Upsilon}\,|\mathcal{A}(\Upsilon\to B_c M)|^2, \tag{30}$$

where the momentum of final states is

$$p_{\rm cm} = \frac{\sqrt{[m_\Upsilon^2-(m_{B_c}+m_M)^2][m_\Upsilon^2-(m_{B_c}-m_M)^2]}}{2\,m_\Upsilon}. \tag{31}$$

The input parameters, including the CKM Wolfenstein parameters, masses of b and c quarks, hadronic parameters including decay constant and Gegenbauer moment of distribution amplitudes in Eq.(8), are collected in Table IV. If not specified explicitly, we will take their central values as the default inputs. Our numerical results on branching ratios for $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decays are displayed in Table V, where theoretical uncertainties come from the CKM parameters, the renormalization scale $\mu = (1\pm0.5)m_b$, hadronic parameters, respectively. For the sake of comparison, previous results of Refs. [15, 16] are re-evaluated with $a_1 = 1.057$. The following are some comments.

(1) For the same final states, branching ratio of nonleptonic Upsilons weak decay increase with the radial quantum number of Upsilons below $B\bar{B}$ threshold, because of two facts, one

TABLE IV: Numberical values of input parameters.

Wolfenstein parameters	
$\lambda = 0.22537 \pm 0.00061$ [1]	$A = 0.814^{+0.023}_{-0.024}$ [1]
masses of charm and bottom quarks	
$m_c = 1.67 \pm 0.07$ GeV [1]	$m_b = 4.78 \pm 0.06$ GeV [1]
decay constants	
$f_\pi = 130.41 \pm 0.20$ MeV [1]	$f_K = 156.2 \pm 0.7$ MeV [1]
$f_\rho = 216 \pm 3$ MeV [21]	$f_{K^*} = 220 \pm 5$ MeV [21]
Gegenbauer moments at scale $\mu = 1$ GeV	
$a_1^\rho = 0$ [21]	$a_2^\rho = 0.15 \pm 0.07$ [21]
$a_1^{K^*} = 0.03 \pm 0.02$ [21]	$a_2^{K^*} = 0.11 \pm 0.09$ [21]
$a_1^\pi = 0$ [21]	$a_2^\pi = 0.25 \pm 0.15$ [21]
$a_1^K = 0.06 \pm 0.03$ [21]	$a_2^K = 0.25 \pm 0.15$ [21]

TABLE V: Branching ratios for $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c M$ decays, where uncertainties of this work are from the CKM factors, scale $\mu = (1+0.5)m_b$, hadronic parameters, respectively; numbers of Ref. [15, 16] are evaluated with $a_1 = 1.057$.

final	$\Upsilon(1S)$ decay			$\Upsilon(2S)$ decay	$\Upsilon(3S)$ decay
states	[15]	[16]	this work	this work	this work
$\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon \to B_c\rho)\times 10^{10}$	0.93	0.58	$1.04^{+0.07+0.05+0.03}_{-0.07-0.02-0.03}$	$2.47^{+0.18+0.11+0.07}_{-0.17-0.05-0.07}$	$3.71^{+0.26+0.17+0.10}_{-0.25-0.08-0.10}$
$\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon \to B_c\pi)\times 10^{11}$	3.48	1.43	$3.39^{+0.24+0.15+0.01}_{-0.23-0.07-0.01}$	$8.27^{+0.59+0.37+0.03}_{-0.56-0.18-0.03}$	$12.40^{+0.88+0.56+0.04}_{-0.84-0.27-0.04}$
$\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon \to B_cK^*)\times 10^{12}$	5.27	3.12	$5.26^{+0.40+0.23+0.24}_{-0.38-0.11-0.24}$	$12.28^{+0.94+0.54+0.57}_{-0.90-0.26-0.56}$	$19.09^{+1.47+0.84+0.89}_{-1.39-0.40-0.87}$
$\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon \to B_cK)\times 10^{12}$	2.53	1.16	$2.51^{+0.19+0.11+0.03}_{-0.18-0.05-0.03}$	$6.18^{+0.48+0.27+0.06}_{-0.45-0.13-0.06}$	$9.30^{+0.72+0.41+0.09}_{-0.68-0.20-0.09}$

is that mass of Upsilon increases with the radial quantum number, which results in the final phase space increases with the radial quantum number; the other is that decay width of Upsilons decreases with the increase of the radial quantum number of Upsilons. Hence, branching ratio for $\Upsilon(3S)$ decay is the largest one among nonleptonic $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S)$ weak decays into the same final B_cM states.

(2) There is a clear hierarchical relation for the same decaying Upsilon, $\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon \to B_c\rho) >$

$\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon\to B_c\pi) > \mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon\to B_cK^*) > \mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon\to B_cK)$. These are two dynamical reasons. One is that the CKM factor $|V_{cb}V_{ud}^*|$ responsible for $\Upsilon \to B_c\pi$, $B_c\rho$ decays is larger than the CKM factor $|V_{cb}V_{us}^*|$ responsible for $\Upsilon \to B_cK^{(*)}$ decays. The other is that Upsilons decay into two pseudoscalar mesons is suppressed by the orbital angular momentum with respect to Upsilons decay into B_cV states with the same flavor structures.

(3) The $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S) \to B_c\rho$ decays have large branching ratio, $\sim 10^{-10}$, which should be sought for with high priority and firstly observed at the running LHC and forthcoming SuperKEKB.

(4) There are many uncertainties. The first uncertainty from the CKM factors could be lessened with the improvement on the precision of the Wolfenstein parameter A in the future. The second uncertainty from the renormalization scale should, in principle, be reduced by inclusion of higher order α_s corrections to hadronic matrix elements. The third uncertainty from hadronic parameters might be reduced with the relative ratio of branching ratios. For example, ingoring the kinematic effects, the relation

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon(mS)\to B_c\pi)}{\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon(3S)\to B_c\pi)} \approx \frac{\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon(mS)\to B_cK)}{\mathcal{B}r(\Upsilon(3S)\to B_cK)} \approx \Big(\frac{A_0^{\Upsilon(mS)\to B_c}}{A_0^{\Upsilon(3S)\to B_c}}\Big)^2, \tag{32}$$

can be used to check various phenomenological models and improve our understanding on the interquark binding forces for heavy quarkonium.

IV. SUMMARY

With anticipation of abundant Upsilons data sample at high-luminosity dedicated heavy-flavor factories, we studied the nonleptonic two-body bottom-changing $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_cM$ weak decays. Considering QCD radiative corrections to hadronic matrix elements with the QCDF approach, and using nonrelativistic wave functions to evaluate the $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_c$ transition form factors, we estimated the branching ratios for $\Upsilon(nS) \to B_cM$ weak decays. It is found that branching ratios for $\Upsilon(1S, 2S, 3S) \to B_c\rho$ decays is large, $\sim 10^{-10}$, which might be detectable at the running LHC and forthcoming SuperKEKB.

Acknowledgments

We thank Prof. Dongsheng Du (IHEP@CAS) and Prof. Yadong Yang (CCNU) for helpful discussion. The work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China

(Grant Nos. 11475055, 11275057, U1232101 and U1332103).

[1] K. Olive *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C 38, 090001 (2014).

[2] S. Herb *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 252 (1977); W. Innes *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 1240 (1977).

[3] C. Patrignani, T. Pedlar, J. Rosner, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 63, 21 (2013).

[4] P. Franzini, J. Lee-Franzini, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 33, 1 (1983).

[5] J. Brodzicka *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. 2012, 04D001.

[6] J. Lees *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 84, 092003 (2011).

[7] R. Briere *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 76, 012005 (2007).

[8] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE Collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. C 74, 2974 (2014).

[9] G. Ada *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 87, 052004 (2013).

[10] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), arXiv:1501.07750.

[11] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), JHEP 1306, 064, (2013).

[12] T. Gershon, M. Needham, C. R. Physique 16, 435 (2015).

[13] http://www-superkekb.kek.jp

[14] M. Sanchis-Lozano, Z. Phys. C 62, 271 (1994).

[15] K. Sharma, R. Verma, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 14, 937 (1999).

[16] R. Dhir, R. Verma, A. Sharma, Advances in High Energy Physics, 2013, 706543 (2013).

[17] M. Wirbel, B. Stech, M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C 29, 637 (1985).

[18] M. Beneke *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1914 (1999); M. Beneke *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B 591, 313 (2000).

[19] G. Buchalla, A. Buras, M. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, 1125, (1996).

[20] G. Lepage, S. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. D 22, 2157, (1980).

[21] P. Ball and G. Jones, JHEP 03, 069 (2007); P. Ball, V. Braun, A. Lenz, JHEP 05, 004 (2006).

[22] J. Sun *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 77, 074013 (2008).

[23] G. Legage *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 46, 4052 (1992); G. Bodwin, E. Braaten, G. Legage, Phys. Rev. D 51, 1125 (1995); N. Brambilla *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 1423 (2005).

[24] B. Xiao, X. Qin, B. Ma, Eur. Phys. J. A 15, 523 (2002).